

REMARKS

1. I don't see any grounds for "Claim 2 rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Antepenko".

- **Antepenko** U.S.Pat.No.5,199,111 Claim: "a pair of generally L-shaped pipes, each having a first end and a second end " page 3, paragraph 62, 63.
- **Hanciulesco** Application No.10,708,966 Claim: "Toilet Tank, having back and front openings connected to an air passageway, an air filter and grille"

To further illustrate the differences between those inventions (above mentioned) see the drawings attached: pag.6 & pag.7

2. If we compare **Antepenko** U.S.Pat.No.5,199,111 with **Pope Sr.** U.S.Pat.No.6,363,542 B1 we see more anticipation than between **Hanciulesco** Application No.10,708,966 and **Antepenko** U.S.Pat.No.5,199,111.

3. Hanciulesco Application No.10,708,966 is:

- A utility invention most desirable in all homes and business offices across U.S.
- A Green House fixture, improving the indoor air quality (I.A.Q), easy to implement with a minimum or no extra cost.
- The inventor is 73 years senior citizen and has been waiting for the patent registration more than 3 1/2 years. (4.03.04)

In the light all of the above, with all do respect, I request for a reconsideration of the rejection and approve the application.

Best regards,

Barbu Hanciulesco

